

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-5 and 7-17 are currently pending and at issue in the present application.

Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added by this Reply.

Claims 1-5 and 7-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tran, US Publication number 2006/0190807 (hereinafter referred to as “Tran”) in view of Rivette et al., US Publication number 2007/0208669 (“Rivette”) and further in view of Blair et al., US Publication number 2002/0112114 (“Blair”).

Applicant requests reconsideration of these rejections, in light of the below remarks.

Substantive Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Examiner has rejected Claims 1-5 and 7-17 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tran in view of Rivette and further in view of Blair.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) states:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Applicant respectfully submits the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 1-5 and 7-17.

Tran and Rivette nowhere teach, disclose or suggest the automatically generated hierarchical diagram including at least one key component and at least one subcomponent associated with the at least one key component, wherein the text-based and graphical-based components are integrally visually generated and linked in a single interactive diagram as

claimed – more particularly wherein the graphical component structure and textual component content being integrally visually generated and linked in a single interactive diagram.

Blair teaches a method of creating a compressed file for use in an electronic request for quotes, including extracting link or symbol information from a received file and storing the extracted link or symbol information in an output file; converting the received file to a raster image and compressing the raster image into an electronic RFQ format file; the output file is used to generate a separate display layer that will display extracted information, and the separate display layer is inserted into the electronic RFQ format file.

Thus, Blair describes a collection of files that are displayed one within the other, not a single file. Blair teaches a navigation tree that is used to navigate this collection of output files. The navigation tree is separate from the display files, as is shown in Fig. 2, and does not contain any of the text of the output files.

In contrast, the present invention is a single file, hierarchically-organized, with no separation between the graphical components and the textual component, and wherein each graphical component of the hierarchy contains the full text content of the corresponding textual component. Thus, Tran, Rivette and Blair, alone and in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The Applicant believes the Examiner is equating the term “diagram” with the concept of user interface “window”. Applicant asserts that a diagram and a UI window are distinct and not equal. To clarify the difference, the claims have been amended to include the term “user interface pane”. A user interface pane is a functional, undivided unit of a user interface window. Blair’s invention is separated and divided across multiple UI panes and thus teaches away from a

diagram in a single UI pane. Tran and Rivette, while teaching diagrams in a single UI pane, do not teach diagrams with graphical and textual components wherein the graphical component contains the full text content of the corresponding textual component.


Amendments of the claims include substantive material from the originally filed application, i.e., from the Specification paragraph 28 and Figure 2. Applicant asserts that no new matter was included inasmuch as these amendments are fully supported by the specification and drawings originally submitted.

CONCLUSION

The Office Action of June 23, 2010, has rejected Claims 1-5 and 7-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tran in view of Rivette and further in view of Blair. The amendments and remarks of Applicant address these rejections. Accordingly, Applicant believes the amended claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the pending rejections is respectfully requested, and a notice of allowance is respectfully sought.

If any issues remain outstanding, incident to the allowance of the application, Examiner AN is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (919) 268-4236 or via email at jinan@trianglepatents.com to discuss the resolution of such issues, in order that prosecution of the application may be concluded favorably to the applicant, consistent with the applicant's making of a substantial advance in the art and particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention.

Respectfully submitted,



Jinan Glasgow, Reg. No. 42585
Triangle Patents
PO Box 28539
Raleigh, NC 27611-8539
919-268-4236 phone